

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
May 24, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on May 24, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – April 19, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the April 19, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the April 19, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Action Item #R20: | Graphic explaining Issue Statement and Issue Sheet development. |
| Status: | A graphic explaining Issues Statement and Issue Sheet development is on the agenda for tonight's meeting. |
| Action Item #R21: | Electronic version of the Issue Statements and resource goals will be distributed to the Work Group via e-mail for review and comment at the next meeting. Comments back to the consulting team by 5-10-01 will be included in review version. |
| Status: | Comments received from Butte County and Plumas NF will be provided to the Work Group for review at this meeting. |

Interim Projects Task Force Report

Report to the Recreation & Socioeconomic Work Group

Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR distributed the Interim Recreation Projects Task Force: Report to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. The report is appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

Steve Nachtman from the consulting team provided a brief overview of the document and the steps the Interim Projects Task Force had taken to date. He detailed the number of times the Task Force met, the process they developed for creating and implementing evaluation criteria, the evaluation and approval process, and finally the prioritization the Task Force used to produce the ranked list of recommended interim projects. He emphasized that the Task Force had started with more than one hundred proposed projects and had reduced that number to 37 recommended projects. Many projects not included in the ranked list of potential interim projects are considered potential long-term by the Task Force and reverted to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for consideration in the Recreation Management Plan as

part of the new license. The Feather River Enhancement Project (Riverbend Park) received the highest ranking from the Task Force.

Several Task Force participants suggested that the ranking process was biased and that the voting process made it possible for a project to receive a disproportionate ranking based on receiving many votes from a few individuals. One suggested the process favored projects below the dam and could be more fairly done to consider the entire Oroville Project, above and below the dam. He suggested that the projects be re-ranked using two separate lists, grouped as either above the dam or below the dam. This would ensure that interim projects occurred in a balanced manner benefiting all areas within the project. Participants agreed that the ranking process should not be a “popularity contest” and that a lower prioritized project or group of smaller projects may have the potential to better serve the community’s needs than a project that garners the most votes at a task force meeting.

Task Force members in attendance agreed that additional information was needed before decisions could be made on a number of the potential interim projects and lack of information made prioritizing the projects difficult. DWR also reported that they were working toward developing a budget for interim projects, understanding that such information would likely be very useful in determining project priority. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group supported the continuation of the Task Force to address the points that were made.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group discussed the process for submitting a final recommended list of interim projects to the Plenary Group. Several participants wanted to move the Riverbend Park Project to the Plenary Group ahead of the other recommended projects. Some participants feared that further delays in moving the project ahead would result in a loss of momentum, local interest, and potential outside funding. Others were concerned that moving a project ahead of the others risked committing all available resources to a single project. They pointed out that the request to move the Riverbend Park Project to the Plenary Group is not in keeping with the guidelines developed and followed by the Task Force. DWR acknowledged the popularity of the Riverbend Project and is not opposed to forwarding it to the Plenary Group alone but suggested that additional information needed to be prepared before presenting it to the Plenary Group. The Plenary Group will have many questions and it was suggested that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group consider these and be prepared to respond.

Craig Jones from the SWC suggested that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group develop a process for packaging the list of recommended projects, and submit them collectively to the Plenary Group. He asked for clarification on what would happen to the projects once they were submitted and presumably accepted by the Plenary Group. Craig felt that it was important to understand what information the Plenary Group as well as DWR might need to process the projects and develop a final recommendation. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed with this and felt that getting that information was critical before any projects are moved ahead.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to initiate a small Task Force to prepare a Riverbend Park presentation package based on the input from the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at this meeting for review at their next Work Group meeting. The Task Force consists of DWR staff and consultants, Feather

Project Website: <http://OrovilleRelicensing.water.ca.gov>

Toll Free Number: 1-866-820-8198

E-mail Address: orovillep2100@water.ca.gov

River Recreation and Park District staff, and Pete Dangermond, representing JPA. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group also agreed to review the Interim Projects Task Force Report and provide comments to DWR by June 8, 2001. DWR will report on the comments received at the next Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group also discussed the need to provide direction to the Task Force for their next activities, since development of a list of Interim Projects completed their assigned tasks. The Work Group agreed to provide suggestions for Interim Task Force direction with their comments on the Interim Task Force Report.

Process Graphic – Where are we?

The Facilitator provided a brief overview of the elements of an Issue Sheet and how Issue Sheet development correlated with other Work Group activities (scoping document preparation, and study plan development). She emphasized that the Issue Sheets are working documents for the Work Group to use while crafting study plans. The more clearly the Issue Sheets reflect the Work Group's collective intent with regard to each Issue Statement, the more precise and focused the Study Plans can be.

Craig Jones asked about the significance of the scoping document and whether it is integrated into the study plan development process. The Facilitator responded that the scoping document is part of NEPA, and since the ALP process brings the NEPA process forward (starts earlier in the relicensing process) a scoping document prior to developing studies is required. Scoping allows the applicant to find out what issues are important to the community and other agencies. If scoping and the study plans are prepared correctly, the information gathered for one should address the requirements of the other.

Ken Kules from MWD asked if the scoping document would include resource goals and geographic scope. Steve Nachtman responded that Scoping Document I for this project would include all the Issue Statements developed by the Work Groups and the Issues that generated them. He added that Scoping Document I would be smaller than the IIP because it does not include all the background information.

Resource Goals and Geographic Scope

The Facilitator distributed revised Issue Statements to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. The revised Issue Statements (including Issue Matrix) is appended to this summary as Attachment 5. She reminded the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that they had approved the Issue Statements for recommendation to the Plenary Group and inclusion in Scoping Document I at their last meeting.

The Facilitator reviewed the structure of the Issue Sheets (issue statement, geographic scope, resource goal, existing information, and needed information) and the development of resource goals. She reminded them that at their previous meeting, the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group tasked the consulting team with revising draft resource goals for each Issue Statement based on input from Work Group members as the first step in developing Issue Sheets. The Issues Statements and draft resource goals were presented to the Work Group as an on-screen graphic to facilitate real-time corrections to the document. Comments contained in letters received from Butte County and Plumas National Forest were shown on the screen in redline/strikeout

Project Website: <http://OrovilleRelicensing.water.ca.gov>

Toll Free Number: 1-866-820-8198

E-mail Address: orovillep2100@water.ca.gov

format for discussion. Copies of the letters were distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and are appended to this summary as Attachments 6 and 7, respectively.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group reviewed and discussed revisions to draft Resource Goals and Geographic Scope for several Issue Statements.

- ♦ The Work Group engaged in an extended discussion regarding the appropriate limits for geographic scope, and whether the study boundary and the solution boundary could be different. Rick Ramirez from DWR stated that the Process Protocol indicates the FERC boundary (often the study boundary) is fixed, but that mitigation may fall outside the boundary. Rick expressed concern that there be a nexus between the study area and project operations. Several participants asked that the Low Flow Area of the River be included within the geographic scope for Issue Statement R1, pointing out that the Riverbend Park Project locations is outside the current FERC boundary and should be included in this scope. DWR pointed out that Issue Statement R1 deals with the adequacy of existing facilities, all of which are within the current FERC boundary. He acknowledged that the solutions could come from outside but for the purposes of study plans associated with this issue statement the FERC boundary is appropriate. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group suggested the consultants take another look at the revisions suggested or other possible language everyone can live with for geographic scope and report back to the Work Group.
- ♦ Patricia Watters observed that the resource goals from other projects she has reviewed seem to be more “visionary” whereas these seem to be more study-oriented. Steve Nachtman responded that the resource goals considered particularly study-oriented had been re-cast as information needs. He provided examples of how resource goals differ from study requests.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group tasked the consultants to revise the resource goals and geographic scope for review at their next meeting. The consultants agreed to send the revised document to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for their review and comment. Comments from the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group are due to Steve Nachtman within one week of receipt of the document.

Next Meeting

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on Thursday, June 28, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM. at the Oro Health Club.

Agreements Made

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review the Interim Projects Task Force Report and provide comment to DWR by June 8.
2. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to provide suggestions for direction to the Interim Project Task Force by June 8.
3. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to convene a small Task Force to prepare a Riverbend Park presentation package based on the input from the Work Group at this meeting, for review at the next Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.

Project Website: <http://OrovilleRelicensing.water.ca.gov>

Toll Free Number: 1-866-820-8198

E-mail Address: orovillep2100@water.ca.gov

4. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review the revised Issue Sheets and provide comments to the consultants.
5. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet again on June 28, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM at the Oro Health Club.

Homework

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to review the Interim Projects Task Force Report and provide comment to DWR by June 8. They also agreed to provide direction to the Interim Projects Task Force to DWR by June 8.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R20: Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group review Interim Task Force document and provide comments including directions for Task Force to DWR by June 8.

Responsible: Work Group
Due Date: June 8, 2001

Action Item #R21: Feather River Recreation and Parks District, JPA contractor, DWR and consultants will prepare presentation package of Riverbend Park for preview at June Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group.

Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: June 28, 2001

Action Item #R22: Review the revised Issue Sheets and provide comments to the consultants.

Responsible: Work Group
Due Date: June 28, 2001

Action Item #R23: Discuss proposed Issue Statement S3

Responsible: Work Group
Due Date: June 28, 2001